

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 11, and 23 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 to Anuff et al. (hereinafter “Anuff”). Claims 5, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 to Maslov (hereinafter “Maslov”).

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Anuff.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Anuff teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29.

Embodiments of the present invention will be described as generating portlets for a portal page. In one embodiment, a portlet is a web-based page or window that is configured to display data from a data source. A portal page is any web-based page that may display one or more portlets. (Application: Paragraph [0019]). In some embodiments, software code is generated using a declarative specification where the software code generates a portlet. (Application: Paragraph [0071]).

In contrast, Anuff merely discloses where the user can customize a portal. In Anuff, the user can select which modules to add to a page, the layout of modules within the page, or the presentation of data within the module. However, Anuff fails to disclose that the user can create the modules of Anuff during an interactive session as recited in amended claim 1. For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “generating software coding that creates a portlet based on the data source specification and the layout specification, the portlet configured to create a visual representation within the portal page of data specified by the data source specification according to the layout specification.” The Office Action points to the model view object that contains display logic for generating HTML in Anuff. However, Anuff does not teach or suggest that the display logic of the module is created as recited in amended claim 1. Anuff discloses that the user may change the way the display logic generates the HTML for a page, but Anuff does not disclose that the user can create the module or its display logic declaratively during an interactive session as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to disclose each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 23 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-22, and 24-29 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 11, and 23 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the allowable subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

Accordingly, in light of the above, Applicants further respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 5, 15, 20, and 26, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Sean F. Parmenter/*  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61276646 v1